FOUNDED 1921

APRIL 1972

EDITOR R.PALME DUTT

LABOUR MONTHLY

MAGAZINE OF LEFT UNITY · 20p

The Editor
Lame Duck Government

Frank Allaun MP
Rents

Alex McFadden
Trade Unions and the Labour Party

Stan Broadbridge
Education Opportunity or Industrial Training?

S. O. Davies—Courageous Leader/R. Page Arnot Cyprus/Dina Machallepis : Vietnam/W. Pomeroy Gunter/Alan Brown : Pollution/Prof. E. Federov

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

Editor: R. Palme Dutt Associate Editor: R. Page Arnot

Managing Editor: Nicola Seyd

VOL. 54 No. 4 APRIL . 1972

CONTENTS

		Page
Notes of the Month: Lame Duck Government. *US and Britain in Movement—Significance of the Miners' Victory—UCS Prospects of Victory—Tory Government's Miscalculations—Testing of Class Strength—Tactics of the Government—A Modern Red Friday—Fight for Britain's Future—Mobilising the Left*	**R.P.D.**	145
Fifty Years Ago		156
Rents. Call for lobby against housing bill	**Frank Allaun MP**	157
May Day. *Declaration of the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions*		160
Trade Unions and the Labour Party	**Alex McFadden**	161
Cyprus. United popular support for Makarios Government	**Dina Machallepies**	165
Tribute to S. O. Davies		168
Courageous Leader. Life and activities of 'S.O.'	**R. Page Arnot**	169
Gunter	**Alan Brown**	173
Education Opportunity or Industrial Training?	**Stan Broadbridge**	175
Environmental Problems (2)	**Academician E. K. Fedorov**	178
Vietnam—Crucial Stage	**William J. Pomeroy**	182
Book Reviews: 'The Economic, Social and Cultural Human Rights in the German Democratic Republic', Professor Bernhard Graefrath: *D. N. Pritt*; 'Democracy at Gunpoint', Andreas Papandreou: *Betty Ambatielos*; 'Politics and Stages of Growth', W. W. Rostow: *P. F. Leeson*; 'Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America', Andre Gunder Frank, and other books on Latin America: *Margaret Goodwin*; 'Conversations with Allende', Régis Debray: *Allen Silverstone*; 'A Short History of Soviet Society', V. Lelchuk and others: *Andrew Rothstein*; 'The Industrial Relations Act', Cyril Crabtree: *Julie Jacobs*		186
Budget to Win	**Nicola Seyd**	192
Publications Received		Inside back cover

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

LAME DUCK GOVERNMENT

'The future will decide that land can only be the property of the nation . . . nationalisation of the land will bring a complete change in the relations of labour and capital and in the final outcome will bring the end of all capitalist production, in industry as well as in agriculture. Only then will class divisions and privileges disappear, together with the economic basis which gives rise to them; and society will be transformed into an association of free producers. To live on another man's labour will become a relationship of the past. Then there will be neither a Government nor a State in oppositon to society.

'Agriculture, mines, industry, in a word all the branches of production, will step by step be organised to bring the greatest benefit. National centralisation of the means of production will be the natural basis of a society which will be composed of associations of free and equal producers consciously conducting their activities on a common rational plan. This is the goal towards which the great economic development of the nineteenth century is striving.'

KARL MARX, Manuscript of reply to questions raised by the Manchester Section of the First International, April 1872 (subsequently published with slight verbal revisions in the *International Herald* of June 15, 1872): text retranslated from the German edition of the *Collected Works of Marx and Engels*, Vol. 18, p. 62.

March 20, 1972

The century which has passed this month since Marx wrote this prophetic vision of the socialist future before mankind has not yet seen fulfilled in Britain the goal of the common ownership of the means of production which he set as the task for the nineteenth century. Over more than one-third of the world socialism has triumphed and established the new social order. In the midst of the manifest deepening crisis, currency conflicts, mass unemployment, chronic inflation and slumps or threats of slump in the capitalist world, the continuous advance of the world of socialist production has gone forward, with Soviet steel output now exceeding American.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But today remarkable new developments are manifesting themselves in the major capitalist countries which have so long been the main citadels of the old social order and the cold war.

US and Britain in Movement

The United States, with the dollar rocking in deficit, with a lost war, with reckless adventures in foreign policy, is riven by social, racial, and class divisions as the democratic forces gather to challenge the domination of reaction. In Britain, in conditions of mass unemployment, inflation and Tory rule, united working class militancy and action has reached a level unequalled since the days of the general strike, and resulted, not in betrayal and defeat for the miners and all workers, as in 1926, but in a signal victory of the miners, prospects of victory of the Upper Clyde shipbuilding workers, and keenly fought battles, including significant cases of gains won, of the workers on many fronts in industry, such as have thrown into a considerable degree of disarray the policies of the most reactionary Tory Government of modern times. Hence the sharpest and the most critical class confrontation of modern times in Britain has now opened, with the whole future of Britain's economic and political development thrown into the balance.

Significance of the Miners' Victory

A landmark in the modern history of the British working class has been constituted by the victory of the epic seven weeks' battle of the miners from January 9 to February 26. This victory was not only a victory for the miners, but for the whole working class. The Tory Government had decided, as in 1921 and 1926, to make the miners the main object of their attack in order to break the militancy and resistance of the whole working class. The mass of the workers in industry understood very clearly the strategy of the Tory Government and rallied to the support of the miners. The result proved very different from the Government's intention. In face of the indomitable and active united fight of the miners, backed by the overwhelming support and significant solidarity actions of the workers in industry, the Government which had begun with such confidence was compelled in the end to climb down and concede the main demands of the miners. This victory of the miners has demonstrated the strength of the working class when there is unity in action.

What Made Victory Possible?

This initial victory of the working class through the success of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miners' strike was made possible because new features in the practice of the struggle were developed by the initiative of the miners and other sections of the workers in industry which had not been present in 1921 and 1926. The victory was made possible because democratic development in the unions had brought sufficient changes to make impossible the strangling role of the central leadership which had betrayed the general strike. The victory was made possible because the unexampled unity and determination and active battle of the miners in their first national strike for forty-six years was accompanied by the grass-roots solidarity actions of the workers in other sections of industry, carrying forward into extended practical forms the embargo placed by the major unions and union leadership on the use of the coal in the coal stocks on which the Government had counted for success. The victory was won with the overwhelming support of the majority of the people, as the opinion polls revealed when they found that three-quarters of those questioned supported the miners. The victory was achieved by new forms of action of the miners and their supporters in industry, which culminated in the mass picketing of the power stations. The turning point was the success of the engineering workers in Birmingham, in united action with the miners, to compel the closing down of the Saltley coke depot, after every means had been employed, including the massive use of police, to endeavour to keep it open.

Toryism in Defeat

The Tory Government, which had entered on the battle with such arrogant confidence, had to end by trying to cover up its defeat ('no one has won') by the face-saving device of the Wilberforce Commission to report in three days and concede the main demands of the miners. Even so, the miners stood out and compelled additional concessions beyond the Wilberforce package. The effect of this victory of the miners continues far-reaching, not only in industry, but also in the political situation. The myth of the inflexible autocratic omnipotence of an ultra-reactionary Tory Government has been smashed. The confidence of the workers has been raised in the consciousness of their strength if their action is united. This is still only the initial stage of the battle to defeat the Tory Government. But even this initial stage of success of the workers has had the effect that the Government has been reduced to desperate efforts to make a show of recasting its programme and tactical approach, to court the TUC leadership, and to pour out a flood of new policies contradicting many of their original declarations of intent.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UCS Prospects of Victory

The miners' victory was not an isolated success of working class militancy. Following the miners' victory in February new indications developed in March pointing to the possible prospect of a positive outcome of the long, courageous and tenacious 'work-in' of the Upper Clyde shipbuilding workers. Here were the key workers whose skill had been the pride of Britain's industry in shipyards which had held Britain in the forefront of world shipbuilding, but which had been allowed to fall into neglect by profit-greedy owners. The Tory Government's solution was to decree closures of shipyards and wholesale sacking of thousands of those employed, with consequences which would have led to far-reaching extension of the already heavy unemployment in the whole region. The workers took a different line. They took over the shipyards under their organised control to maintain all four yards in production and to continue employment of all the workers. This audacious initiative electrified all sections of the workers and public opinion all over the country, and won enthusiastic support from all trade unionists, including solidarity action of the organised working class in Glasgow, and from students and all sections of the popular and democratic forces.

Portent for the Future

Here was demonstrated for all to see the role of the working class as the creative force in the economy for the expansion of production and full employment against the Tory Government's regime of mass unemployment and restriction of production. In vain the monopoly press sought in the early stages to pour scorn on the heroic fight of the UCS workers as 'an emotional response which has little relation to the hard economic facts' (*Guardian*); 'doomed to fail' (*Times*); 'a sign of impotence' (*Sunday Times*). Once again in the end the Government, in face of this indomitable united struggle of the UCS workers backed by all sections of the working class, fighting without reservation for the demand of maintaining all four shipyards in production and no sackings, had to climb down, and raise its financial provision from £6 million to £35 million to cover the continuance of three of the four yards, with arrangements in hand for an American firm to take over the running of the fourth, conditional on completion of negotiations and government financial backing. These arrangements have not yet been finalised at the time of writing; but this prospect of a positive outcome of the heroic fight of the UCS workers, following the victory of the miners, and alongside a wide range of significant fights and gains won on a number of fronts in industry, have shown

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the strength of the workers in action, and the capacity of such action, despite mass unemployment and the blows of the government offensive, to inflict defeat of this ultra-reactionary Tory Government.

Tory Government's Miscalculations

When the Heath Ministry took office in the summer of 1970, on the basis of a minority electoral vote, they began with a determination to carry through a 'fundamental change in policy' by applying the most rigid doctrinaire conservative principles in place of the despised supposedly soft policies of previous Administrations condemned as conciliators. They slashed social provisions and multiplied many times over the cruel range of the means test, of course in the name of 'fair play', just as they introduced legislation to double or treble rents and send house prices soaring beyond the reach of any normal family in the name of 'fair rents'. They proclaimed their opposition to state intervention in industry, hived off sections from the nationalised industries to private interests, and denounced subsidies to 'lame ducks'. Only when the disastrous consequences of their economic policies became manifest, with mass unemployment soaring to levels unequalled since 1940, and manufacturing investment in 1971 actually decreasing by 8 per cent, did they realise that it was their Government which was the real 'lame duck' desperately needing emergency panaceas to retrieve its fortunes, and proceeded to adopt all the types of measures they had previously denounced, with pouring out of tens of millions of pounds of public money to aid enterprises in difficulties; revival of schemes of state-financed backing for investment in regions of high unemployment; and loudly proclaimed plans for an industrialists' bonanza budget of tax concessions and expansionary expenditure to boost the ailing economy. But in no sphere were the initial miscalculations of the Tory Government more manifest than in the sphere of class relations.

Old Weapons and New Battles

When the Heath Ministry decided to take on the miners as the central battleground of their offensive to curb the militancy of the working class, they performed the classic role of an ultra-reactionary Government in a situation of rising working class militancy, abstractly determined to be 'strong' and to demonstrate its strength against the workers—and in practice with a glaring lack of understanding of the real relations of class strength today. Recalling 1921 and 1926 they thought they could make the miners once again the whipping block in order to inflict defeat on the whole working class.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They forgot 1912 when the victorious strike of the million-strong miners reduced to submission the Liberal Prime Minister Asquith, who had pontifically proclaimed in parliament that their demand for a minimum wage bill was a violation of the fundamental laws of economics, and had to end up by himself introducing the miners' Minimum Wage Bill.* They forgot 1919 when the strike ballot of the miners compelled Lloyd George's devious expedient of appointing the Sankey Commission to recommend nationalisation. Gaily the Heath Ministry entered on the battle, imagining that as in 1921 and in 1926 they would be able to wear down the miners into submission. Had they not piled up masses of coal stocks in preparation? 'Coal stocks now stand at 30 million tons, so the country is in a good position to face a stoppage' (*Daily Telegraph*, December 31, 1971). 'Government's aim to see that strikes do not pay' was the complacent declaration of the *Times* on January 18 in the second week of the strike. Such was the confident outlook of official ruling class circles at the beginning of the strike.

Testing of Class Strength

The Government strategists had not calculated on the present high level of working class militancy and solidarity, despite mass unemployment, despite the blows of reaction, and despite inadequacies in sections of the top leadership. The miners, with the overwhelming unity and determination of their first national strike since 1926, were not prepared to let themselves be passively worn down into defeat as in 1921 and 1926. They took the initiative in action. The central union leadership did not adopt joint strike action, as in 1926, but asked all the unions not to handle any coal or fuel which could be used for coal. The miners proceeded to organise on the most extensive scale round-the-clock pickets, first on the coal stocks; then, with the co-operation of other sections, on the transport of coal; and finally the culminating strategy, involving the organised transport under union auspices of large bodies of miners to the most widely dispersed areas, the mass picketing of the power stations all over the country, and also against the transport of coal on the water, with the active co-operation of other unions and all sections of the workers. Thereby the Government strategy was thrown into confusion. In vain all the

* It was of this miners' national strike of 1912 that Lenin wrote: 'The miners' strike certainly marks a new epoch . . . since the strike the British proletariat *is no longer the same*. The workers have learned to fight. They have discovered the *path* that will lead to victory. They have become aware of their power.' (Lenin, *The British Labour Movement in 1912*, reprinted in *Lenin on Britain*, pp. 151-2.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

official propagandists complained that this mass picketing was illegal. Indeed, the Government's legal experts are now busily engaged to devise new legislation to prevent such mass picketing in future. Certainly the law on picketing is capable of being interpreted in all kinds of directions, as many famous cases have shown. But in the final test the interpretation of the law in a given case depends, not on the opinion of a court, but on the relative strength of the class forces involved in a particular situation. Attempts were made to break the mass picketing by police action; there were many confrontations and incidents; one picket was killed by the lorry of a blackleg driver. But in the outcome the attempt to break the mass picketing by the use of police failed. The success of the Birmingham engineering workers, acting alongside the miners, to compel the closing of the Saltley coke depot proved the turning point. Chief Constables became increasingly reluctant to pit their police against the mass pickets of the miners and the large numbers of organised sections of the workers supporting them.

Tactics of the Government

But if police action failed, what then? The use of troops? There have indeed been notorious occasions when troops have been used in industrial disputes to perform unfamiliar tasks as blacklegs 'in order to maintain essential supplies'. But no troops can hew coal. Only the miners can produce the coal, the lifeblood of the country's economic life. In other European capitalist countries this elementary truth has been understood, and the level of miners' wages is notably higher than the level of manufacturing workers' wages. But the Tory rulers in Britain had placed themselves in the strategically impossible position of simultaneously holding down the level of miners' wages below that of comparable manufacturing workers and planning to make the miners when they demanded an increase of their wages to comparable levels the main object of attack in order to inflict a defeat on the whole working class. Once the united resistance of the miners and the wide sections of organised workers supporting them had reached the culminating strategy of the mass picketing of the power stations, the Tory Ministers knew that their plan for victory by attrition had been beaten. They duly proclaimed an Emergency. They imposed the power cuts. But the traditional experience of class strategy even of this obstinate Tory Government saved them from surrendering to the clamour of their more ardent zealots for a fight to a finish by bringing in the use of troops. Even as late as February 15, after the Wilberforce Commission had reported, when the miners

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were standing out for concessions beyond the Wilberforce Report, the *Daily Telegraph* was fulminating about 'a fight to the bitter end', 'the use of troops to break the picket lines around the power stations' and the necessity 'to vindicate the ultimate sovereignty of the state'.

Wilberforce Commission

The tactics of the Government were different. Their appointment of the Wilberforce Commission was to provide respectable cover of a supposed independent enquiry to justify the concessions they knew they would have to make to the miners. When the miners stood out to demand more than the Wilberforce Report the final settlement conceded more (£95 million as against £85 million). The Tory Ministers were well aware that the settlement would be denounced as a sell-out by the apostles of 'a fight to the bitter end'; and indeed it was so described in the *Daily Telegraph* of February 22 when their feature writer Paul Einzig declared that 'the Government's surrender over the coal strike is the result of the Wilberforce Report, just as the Munich surrender was the result of the Runciman Report' (amazing how the Munichites nowadays love to use 'Munich' as a term of abuse). But in fact the Government was following the traditional strategy of the British ruling class to conduct a tactical retreat in an unfavourable situation in order to win time to recast their strategy for the future fulfilment of their aims. This is the decisive stage of the fight for the future which has now opened.

A Modern Red Friday

The victory of the miners' strike in February 1972 has been celebrated as a high level of the working class movement unequalled since the days of 1926. Indeed it is true that the height of working class militancy and the strike movement in 1971 and the first quarter of 1972 has been unequalled since those days, while the strength of working class organisation is very much greater. But there is this notable difference. 1926, which saw the greatest historic demonstration of the united action of the widest sections of the working class in response to the general strike, saw also the shameful betrayal of the general strike by the majority of the General Council, leading to the isolation of the miners and the consequent defeat inflicted on the miners and the whole working class. The conditions have now gathered to change this record. The present moment of the victory of the miners in February 1972 is comparable rather to the victory of Red Friday in July 1925, when the combined stand of the Triple Alliance of the miners, railwaymen and transport workers compelled

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Baldwin Tory Government to retreat from its planned attack on the miners and grant the nine months subsidy to the coal industry. The purpose of the nine months subsidy was to buy time in order to prepare the future attack. Every day of the nine months was used by the Tory Government to perfect its preparations, build up its strike-breaking organisation and marshal the most complete emergency structure of counter-revolution. Part of this preparation was the arrest of the twelve Communist leaders in order to behead the working class revolt and ensure that when the battle began such foremost militant leaders of the working class as Pollitt and Gallacher and the others should be in prison. From the first day of the nine months the call was ceaselessly sounded by the Communists and the left to use every moment of these crucial months to prepare for the battle which would follow. But the central leadership of the trade unions remained passive. When the day came, the Government in fact provoked the general strike, forcing the hands of a central leadership which at the very last moment was vainly knocking at the doors of 10 Downing Street only to find them closed against it. Even so the overwhelming response of the workers startled equally the Government and the unprepared leaders. A deceptive formula had to be worked out between the Government and the leaders of the General Council in order to put through the betrayal equally of the general strike, of the miners and of the whole working class. Now the opportunity has come to bring a different outcome.

Signal for Today

Red Friday of February 18, 1972, when the Government surrendered to the miners, has brought in new conditions the hour of opportunity of Red Friday of July 30, 1925. Once again a Tory Government has had to yield concessions to the united stand of the workers in order to buy time and restructure its strategy for the fulfilment of its further aims. But this time the working class movement can be alert and ready to defeat the Tory plans and carry forward the initial advantage gained to launch the full offensive against the Tory Government, force its resignation and an election in the conditions of an upsurge of the mass movement, and thereby mobilise all the militant and left forces to win the day for the far-reaching changes in policy which are urgently needed in Britain.

The Fight for Britain's Future

The most critical testing time, and also the moment of greatest opportunity, has opened for the whole working class movement and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all who wish to see a different future for Britain from the present disastrous outcome of the policies of the Tory Government and, it must be added, of previous Labour Governments. There is no room for under-estimating the seriousness of the situation. The official return of the present total of mass unemployment represented by a million registered unemployed is now universally admitted to be an under-statement, since the parallel official return of the numbers employed has shown since 1966 a decrease of over two millions.

> More than 2½ million people—more than 10 per cent of the working population—were not employed in June 1971, but would have been employed if there had been no increase in registered unemployment and in the inactive population from 1966.
>
> Some small part of the rise in the inactive population may have been due to the changing age structure of the population and to longer periods in education.
>
> But it remains a safe generalisation that by last summer one in ten of the employable population was not working. Even allowing for them being potentially less productive than the average of those employed, this was costing the country £3,000-£4,000 million a year.
>
> (Peter Jay, Economic Editor, *Times*, March 2, 1972)

Yet all the official voices of the economists, the civil servants and Tory ministers offer as the best hope for some future date a 'tolerable' level of unemployment, the figure most usually favoured being half a million. The whole working class should be in revolt against this complacent assumption of permanent mass unemployment. The inspiration of the UCS workers' fight for full employment and no sackings aroused universal support. But the fight to accomplish this aim on a nation-wide scale will require radical changes in the way of planning the economy to take the key sectors out of the hands of the monopolists and speculators. It is not a question of a nominal label of 'socialism', which honoured term is now used for very different purposes by every charlatan (it was used by Hitler). Nor is it a question of the myth of the 'mixed economy', which is only the misleading camouflage for the continued domination and exploitation by the big monopolies under the cover of state official patronage and co-ordination. What is needed is a concrete present programme to make inroads against the monopolies and bring sections of the economy into the control of the popular movement and its Government. Such a common programme is the essential need at the present stage in order to rally mass support against the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policies of Toryism and the allies of Toryism in the labour movement, and open the way to real change in Britain.

Readiness for Battle

There is no time to be lost in mobilising the forces to make possible the fulfilment of these tasks of far-reaching social and political change in Britain. The Government is determined to drive through parliament this year its plot to surrender the British people into servitude to the ultra-monopolists of the Common Market, against the wishes of the people, without electoral mandate, without any opportunity for the people to express their wishes, without even the referendum adopted in the other countries concerned, and in defiance of the constitutional obligation to submit an issue of such magnitude to the electorate. To defeat this anti-democratic offensive the most active and widespread fight will be needed to force an election this year. The Government has placed the Industrial Relations Act on the statute book in order to shackle and paralyse the rights of the unions won by generations of struggle, and enacted in face of all the declarations of opposition of the unions. The united refusal of eight million trade unionists to register, in fulfilment of the Special TUC decision, has demonstrated the will to resist. But there is no question that the Government is shaping its strategy to operate the clauses in order to fulfil its aim to bring the unions under control. In consequence big battles for elementary trade union rights are in prospect in the coming period.

Traps for the Unwary

At the same time the Government, drawing its lesson from its experience with the miners, is now actively courting the trade union leaders. While the blunderbuss of Mr Heath's Act is pointed at the heart of the unions, the General Council is invited to tea and whisky at 10 Downing Street. The old hypocritical talk about an 'incomes policy' (meaning of course wages, not incomes from property) is being spread in a variety of quarters. While a Gunter departs, a Roy Jenkins remains Deputy Leader and is given lavish oceans of space in the millionaire press to pour out his anti-socialist rehash of liberal platitudes denying the class struggle of capital and labour, and concentrating his fire instead on the car workers in language calculated to set one group of workers against another. Thus it would be sanguine to imagine that the labour movement is at present equipped and ready for the fulfilment of the tasks which now so urgently arise, to defeat the Tory offensive, rally the widest popular

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

support in order to force an election, and to ensure that the outcome of such an election will bring real social and political changes.

Mobilising the Left

The example of the miners' fight and victory has demonstrated the strength and capacity of the working class, once united action is taken, to inflict defeat on the Tory Government. Such a rallying of the united stand of the working class and the masses of the people in the political field is now essential in order to bring the winds of change. And the first step to win the fulfilment of this aim needs to be the mobilisation of all the militant forces of the left, equally in the trade unions and in the political labour movement, equally communist and non-communist together, in association with the groups of all those active in special fields or on special issues, the students, women's organisations and organs of anti-racialist and anti-colonialist struggle, to combine on the basis of a common immediate programme both for the present fight against the Tory Government, and to rally mass support to bring it down and force an election, and to promote the fullest expression of the aims of this fight in the conduct of such an election.

R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY FIFTY YEARS AGO

The existing forms of British trade union organisation can be roughly divided into craft, industrial or general labour unions, while against these actually existing forms may be set the ideal of many in the movement, unrealised in fact but powerful as a stimulus—the notion of the One Big Union.

Now I do not wish for a moment to suggest that we must scrap these existing forms of organisation and turn to the One Big Union, because I know that as things are at present it would not matter two pennyworth of common gin if Arthur Henderson, J. R. Clynes and all the other leaders were to pray for the One Big Union every night before they went to bed. The temper of the British labour movement is such that even the conversion of its best-known leaders to such an idea as that of the One Big Union would not have any practical result until it has been demonstrated again and again that every other form of organisation is futile. Therefore the practical outcome of a consideration of the engineering lock-out in relation to the other unions, and therefore to the present form of union organisation, is that we must have one more try to improve the organisations that exist already. But if this one more try fails, there seems to me no alternative to turning to the One Big Union form of organisation.

The plan I propose is therefore not one touching the structure of the individual trade unions, but accepting them for better or worse.

(From 'The Engineering Lock-out',
by W. H. Hutchinson, *Labour Monthly*, April 1922)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RENTS

Frank Allaun MP

THE Conservative leaders don't talk about the class struggle—they practise it. The Housing Finance Bill is a perfect example of their strategy. It has nothing to do with housing, with reducing the mass of human misery caused by the acute housing shortage. It is a *finance* measure, and its main aim is to shift the burden of hundreds of millions of pounds a year from the shoulders of the Treasury to those of the tenants. Nor is this just another failure by the Government to keep down the cost of living. On the contrary, it is a deliberate increase in what is a major item in most working class family budgets —the rent.

It will affect three sections of the people: council house tenants, private landlords' tenants and those wishing to buy their own homes.

Take council rents first. There are 5½ million council tenants who, with their families, account for roughly 16½ million people, or about one third of the population. Their rents will, on average, be more than doubled by 1976. We know this, because it is the estimate of the Department of the Environment itself as stated in its internal document, which has been brought to light.

This doubling of rents will be brought about in two ways. First, the Government has declared its intention to reduce by up to £200 million a year the subsidies which would have been paid to the local authorities by 1975. Second, council tenants will no longer have their rents fixed by their local authority. In future they will be decided by a Government-appointed body, the Rent Scrutiny Board, against whose decision there will be no appeal. These rents will not be determined on the basis of the cost of the houses. They will, I repeat, be far higher. Councils will be forced—even though their housing accounts are in balance—to make a profit out of their tenants. That is why these are profit rents, not fair rents at all.

The first instalment will be 50p per week in April. If councils refuse to impose this rise as requested they are to be *forced* to put on £1 a week in October. Thereafter the rents will be raised by 50p a week a year until the new full rent is reached. After that they will be 'reviewed' every three years, which means further rises indefinitely into the future.

The Rent Scrutiny Boards will send officials to inspect houses they intend to assess. One particularly objectionable little clause in this 103-clause Bill says that if the tenant refuses admission to the officers he can be fined £50. So an Englishman's home is no longer his castle!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In addition nearly 1½ million private landlords' tenants who still remain in rent control are to come out of control. Their rents will not just be doubled. They will go up to 2½ times the existing rent on average. We know this because this figure has been extracted from the Ministry, for houses which have already been decontrolled and brought into the rent regulation machinery. These will mostly be the very worst houses—homes without a bath, hot water or inside w.c., and slum houses not yet scheduled for slum clearance.

House purchase prices will also be affected. Many tenants are saying to themselves: 'Well, if my rent is going to be doubled, and I'll have nothing to show for it even after years of rent paying, I might as well try to buy my own house—even if I can't really afford to do so.' This unnatural increase in the pressure to buy will force up purchase prices even faster than they went up last year, which was by 20 per cent.

A further decline in council house building is almost certain. For there will be great numbers of families living in terrible housing conditions, who will be unable to afford to go into council houses at the new rates, despite any available rebate. As for the rebates, those who *do* apply for and succeed in obtaining them will mostly find that they are less than the increases they are forced to pay.

Many tenants have been misled by the tables they have read in their newspapers, helpfully provided by Messrs Walker and Amery. One of these, for example, shows that if you have a family income (for the man and wife combined) of £30 gross (and that means a lot less by the time national insurance, graduated pensions contribution and income tax have been deducted), and you have two children, your £5 a week rent will be reduced by £1. What is the trick? It is this. The £5 a week rent plus rates will be the *new* rent in many cases. The present rent for that council house may be only £2 a week plus rates. It will go up from £2 to £5, and come down to £4 plus rates. So that the tenant will still be paying twice his previous rent.

The National Executive Committee of the Labour Party has a working party at present engaged in drawing up an alternative housing finance policy for the time the next Labour Government is elected. Whilst the final proposals have not yet been produced the preliminary statement includes eight points. I will mention only the first two. The next Labour Government will (1) repeal the Conservative Housing Finance Act, if it has become law by then; (2) restore housing subsidies sufficient to provide an adequate supply of council houses and reasonable rents.

Obviously the best way to kill the Bill would be a general election.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But we can't wait till then. There are some people in our movement who say that nothing can be done about it till the election; that the Tories have a safe parliamentary majority; and that, though they may split on the Common Market, they certainly will not split on hitting the tenants.

I do not accept this view. Take the case of the miners who, with the support of other trade unionists, inflicted a historic defeat on the Government. Consider also the example of the UCS. There can be no doubt that the Cabinet intended to close down two of the four shipyards on the Clyde. Thanks to the actions of the UCS shop stewards, the march of 80,000 through the streets of Glasgow and the one-day stoppage in the West of Scotland, the Cabinet have been forced to retract. They have now actually invested £35 million of Government money in the shipyards.

The rent issue is far more extensive in its range than the Scottish shipbuilding industry. It affects half the population directly in their pockets. And the campaign is now growing fast. Almost every tenants' association and trades council and working class party branch is holding meetings on the Bill. Nearly two million copies of a rents broadsheet have been sold by the Labour Party headquarters to constituency parties within a month. Even the powerful Association of Municipal Corporations, representing the borough councils, which until this May's local elections is Conservative dominated, has passed a resolution pressing the Government for five major modifications.

And now the great trade unions are moving into action, rightly saying that a big rent increase is equivalent to a big wage reduction. The TUC has condemned the Bill. The Transport Workers' Union is demanding its repeal. The tenants are in an extremely militant mood. I hope they will not wait till October when the £1 a week rent increase is due to be applied. By then the Bill may have become law. It would be better to have militancy *now*, for I believe that we can compel even this hardline bunch of reactionaries in the Government to climb down. Tenants should lobby their MPs—particularly Tory MPs—right away.

If the Prime Minister says that five per cent is the maximum tolerable for price increases in industry, then how can he defend increases of up to 25 per cent per year in rents? If pressure can make Heath cut some food prices we can make him drop his Bill to double rents.

Democracy is by no means perfect; it has its limitations. But I do believe that if a sufficient number of people want a thing badly and determinedly enough they can get it.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAY DAY

The following extracts are from the Declaration of the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions, as presented to the February 12 Conference.

Unemployment is rocketing—now more than 1½ million workers, including more than 70,000 young people under 18, of whom 10,000 are school leavers, are robbed of their right to work, and their living standards are cruelly cut down. Altogether more than five million men, women and children are directly affected. . . .

The Government's preparations to operate the Industrial Relations Act are still going ahead. By February 28, all sections of the Act and all the machinery (tribunals, courts, committees, etc.) will have become operational.

In the light of the sharpening dangers from these twin evils it is high time for the working class and its organisations to prepare for an intensification of the struggles that face them. Great class battles, on a number of fronts, are being fought, and more are in the course of preparation. . . .

But in this favourable situation the General Council of the TUC, instead of giving leadership, is dragging its feet. Instead of taking decisive action against those who are refusing to carry out the Congress decisions on the Industrial Relations Act, the General Council vacillates and compromises, and the offending unions take advantage of this weakness, and by their actions actively support the Tory Government in its attack on the trade union movement. . . .

The outstanding need today is to step up the mass movement and the exerting of maximum pressures to ensure the implementation of the 1971 TUC decisions and the taking of immediate action against those unions proposing to register or co-operate with any of the institutions and agencies set up by the Act.

Demands must be made for the right to work, and support given by every section of the movement to those who take action to maintain this right.

Mass action must include industrial action to compel the implementation of the economic policies decided on at the 1971 TUC and Labour Party Conferences. . . .

May 1 must be made an outstanding day of struggle and confrontation against the Tory Government and its foul works. Conference calls for a national stoppage and demonstrations in every major city. Campaigning and preparations must start now and Great Britain must be ringed with mass demonstrations and protests on May 1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRADE UNIONS AND THE LABOUR PARTY

Alex McFadden*
Executive Committee Member
National Union of Railwaymen

IN 1899, the forerunner of the NUR, the ASRS, submitted the following resolution to the TUC:

> That this Congress having regard to its decisions of former years, and a view to securing a better representation of interests of labour in the House of Commons, hereby instructs the Parliamentary Committee to invite the co-operation of all the co-operative, socialistic, trade union, and other working organisations to jointly co-operate on lines mutually agreed upon, in convening a special congress of representatives from such of the above named organisations as may be willing to take part to devise ways and means for securing the return of an increased number of Labour members in the next parliament.

When the resolution was debated, and the president began to announce the decision, the delegates waited in breathless silence: 'Five hundred and fourty-six thousand for the resolution; against, four. . . .' He got no further, for the delegates knew the resolution had been carried. The scenes that followed, as delegates stood on their chairs raising their hats and cheering, with what has been called 'indescribable enthusiasm', can easily be appreciated. A new weapon had been added to the armoury of the trade union and labour movement. Eventually, the president was able to complete his reading of the voting and this revealed that there was a majority of 112,000. So the first phase in the long struggle to achieve independent labour representation in parliament had been won.

The trade union movement had taken on a new dimension. They believed that only good would come from this new alliance, and indeed this proved to be so for a number of years, during which many important items of legislation found their way on to the statute book. These items, though long overdue, gave a measure of protection to the workers and the trade unions. Thus the bond between the trade unions and the Labour Party grew stronger. The trade unions

---

* Alex McFadden is Secretary of the NUR's Negotiating Committee.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

introduced political levies to maintain this representation and to support the Labour Party, which in themselves produced long legal arguments; the final settlement came as a result of judgement arising out of what became known as the 'Osborne Case', which again involved the ASRS.

From those early days the trade unions have recognised the difference between the employers and the employees. The class struggle was as clear to them as it is to many in the trade union movement today. But that does not hold good with the Labour Party, which appears to have lost touch with the mass of the movement. History suggests that the on-coming generation is usually more radical than the existing generation. But the Labour Party now wants to retain a mixed economy. No longer is the word socialism contained in the vocabulary of many of the leaders. They also believe that 'Clause Four' should be buried along with those who first thought of it. They tend to regard the trade unions as many regard their old folks: they should be put into an old persons' home, and only visited once in a while with the safe knowledge that they will *never* let you down no matter what you have done to them.

The unions have never held back in their support for the Labour Party. But whenever they have attempted, at Labour Party Conference, to get the ship back on to the right course they are accused of 'rocking the boat', when all they were attempting to do was to get back to the original concept of socialist philosophy the movement started off with. The old saying that 'he who pays the piper calls the tune' could never apply to the relationship that exists between the trade unions and the Labour Party.

The unions have never failed to respond generously to the many appeals for financial assistance made by the Party, particularly at the time of general elections.

Trade unionists, as individual members of the Party, are forever digging into their pockets to support raffles, fêtes, special efforts and the like to maintain the local and national Party organisations. Yet the Party fails to recognise this. Once in 'office' they seem to bank on the loyalty of the workers and their trade unions, claiming that as a Government they are not bound by any decision taken at the Party Conference. This position *must be changed.* No longer can the trade unions afford to accept policies from any Labour Government that are not in the best interests of their members, the movement generally, or the good of the nation. George Brown's prices and incomes policies were accepted on the grounds that they were an attempt to improve the real value of wages. The credibility of this was destroyed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when wages were frozen whilst prices were allowed to continue to rise.

Entry into the Common Market is but another example of the gap between the trade unions and the leadership of the Party. This and their proposed legislation, *In Place of Strife*, with its obnoxious penal clauses, are but two issues that contributed to the defeat of the Labour Government in the 1970 general election. Trade unionists who had founght so hard for the return of Labour candidates in the past, refused to lend a hand that time. Indeed, many, for the first time in their life refused to record their vote—something that they never thought would be a possibility in their lifetime.

This disillusionment still prevails; a wound has been inflicted that will take a long time to heal, and, even when healed, many will continue to remember that a wound was inflicted. What support was given to the Union of Post Office Workers in their struggle by the Parliamentary Labour Party? In asking that question it is accepted that not all trade unions rallied (nor did the TUC) to the aid of the postal workers to the extent they might have.

What of the miners' dispute, their first official dispute since 1926, at which time they were locked-out? It was not until the strike was well established, with plenty of public support behind it, that the leadership of the Party began to speak in support of the miners. Yet the loyalty of the miners and their families to the Labour Party is there for us all to see. They have returned Labour MPs, election after election, with such massive majorities that the Tories refused (or were unable to get candidates) to contest many mining constituencies. The struggle of the miners was not so much with the National Coal Board as it was with the Government and its wages policies. Not even the Tory press could argue against the case of the miners. So it was an industrial/political struggle. The battlefield was there ready made, and if the generals had been able to read the signs, deployed the united forces of the Parliamentary Labour Party and trade union movement correctly, this Government could have been brought down. Defeated it was, but not destroyed. Already tottering on the brink due to its policies that have, amongst other things, created over one million unemployed, one final push, and, like the glorious victory of the miners, victory could have been ours. Now they can retreat, lick their wounds and hope to recover.

Already the Government is preparing to attack on at least two fronts. One is aimed to weaken the trade unions through the Industrial Relations Act (even though it offers some financial gain for those prepared to register, and permit themselves to be put into the chains that their forefathers broke free from). Thus, having, so they

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hope, weakened the trade unions, scared some of the leadership into playing along with them, the second attack is underway. This time our living standards are their objective. Their 'Fair Rents Policy' means higher rents for all, more profits for the landlords; entry into the Common Market means higher prices for most goods, and the bringing into line of our agricultural policy will lead to sharp increases in the price of food. In holding down wage levels whilst prices continue to rise and profits increase, unemployment will continue to rise. The fear of joining the ranks of the unemployed, the Government hope, will act as a deterrent to further claims for higher wages and better working conditions.

The mood of the movement has changed, sparked off possibly by the action of shipbuilders on the Upper Clyde, where complete victory is almost theirs, and continued in other directions by other sections of the movement at rank-and-file level. So here too the gap between the workers and their representatives needs to be closed. The issues are therefore clear. The movement must be quickly united, confidence restored by a sincere attempt (unlike the 'fight' in parliament against entry into the Common Market) to defeat this Tory Government and bring about its downfall, to see the return of a Labour Government pledged to socialist policies which will bring full employment and ever improving standards of living for the workers. And those within the Party not prepared to support such policies should be told to get out!

That resolution way back in 1899, which set about 'securing better representation of the interests of labour . . .', meant what it said, and it is for us to see that it is carried to fruition.

Seldom has there been a time like the present when the need for unity between the trade unions and the Labour Party was more necessary or more urgent. But that unity *must* be based upon sound policies and understanding of the needs of the movement if it is to carry any influence and command support. A Tory Government in 'office', regardless of its policies, could always be considered sufficient reason for bringing about a unity of purpose. But the policies of this present Tory Government, aimed at tearing the heart out of the trade unions through its Industrial Relations Act, underlines the urgency of this present situation.

The challenge is there: we have to accept it, and we must not fail. The enthusiasm which greeted the carrying of that resolution in 1899 has to be recreated. The rank-and-file by their recent actions have shown that they are ready. Now it is up to the leaderships to respond accordingly.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CYPRUS

Dina Machallepis

'WE all know that the Cyprus problem is now passing through its most critical stage since the proclamation of the Cyprus Republic. We know that the imperialist factor, with American imperialism as the spearhead, plots, conspires, undermines and, in general, plans to impose its own solution. . . . We also know that dates have been fixed for the enforcement of this imperialist solution on the people of Cyprus. And these dates are placed in the coming two-to-three months at the utmost.'

This prediction was made by Mr E. Papaioannou, the Secretary of the Progressive Party of the Working People (AKEL) in one of his speeches on August 29, 1971. Unfortunately for Cyprus the events of the last few weeks have proved Mr Papaioannou right. The Greek military regime, in a desperate effort to present Cyprus on a plate to its Nato allies, has sent an ultimatum to the President of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, demanding, if not his actual resignation, that he obeys Athens, allegedly the centre of Hellenism.

However, this was not plain guessing on the part of Mr Papaioannou, but a realistic analysis of the situation. As far back as 1959, AKEL, evaluating the positive and negative elements of the Zürich-London agreement which declared Cyprus an independent republic, stressed the dangers emanating from the provisions of the agreement, the preservation of the British military bases, the presence of foreign armies (950 Greek and 650 Turkish soldiers) and the right of intervention by the three self-appointed guarantors (Britain, Greece, Turkey) in the internal affairs of Cyprus.

On the basis of this evaluation, AKEL characterised as anti-imperialist and national-liberation in character the new phase of struggle faced by Cyprus, and stated that the main object of its policy was the completion of Cyprus independence. 'To achieve this goal,' says the Party programme formulated in the early sixties, 'it is necessary to follow an anti-imperialist policy at home and abroad, rid Cyprus of economic and political dependence and imperialist influence, eliminate military bases, democratise the country's political and social life and rehabilitate its economy.'

Towards this end AKEL fought for parliamentary representation. Since, in 1960, the Party could not count on more than 35 per cent of the votes in any one of the island's six constituencies, AKEL came to an agreement with the Patriotic Front of Cyprus, a coalition of several groups and associations which recognised President

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Makarios as its leader. Under this agreement all five AKEL candidates were elected. During the decade that followed, AKEL, despite its few seats, made itself heard in parliament, at the same time gaining considerable experience. By 1963, however, due to the unworkable constitution of Cyprus which stipulated a Greek President and a Turkish Vice-President, each having the right to veto the other—which they did frequently—antagonism and mutual distrust between the two communities grew immensely and finally culminated in the atrocities of Christmas 1963: these events marked the beginning of a new phase of the Cypriot struggle for freedom. This phase was characterised by the aggressive insistence of the imperialist alliance of Nato to impose on the Cypriots a solution that would serve its strategic interests in the region of the Middle East. This was expressed in the cynical interference of the US leaders Ball, Acheson, Lemnitzer and Cyrus Vance, who had all appeared with plans to settle the Cyprus question. But all those plans came up against a resolute 'No' from a united people.

Due to a tense domestic situation, the first Cyprus parliament was in office for ten years instead of five as stipulated by the constitution. The island's second general elections took place in 1970. This time AKEL decided to campaign on its own and put forward nine candidates. All nine won: AKEL polled 40 per cent of the votes.

AKEL in parliament always supported the Makarios Government's measures to restore peace, and welcomed the intercommunal talks as the only way to solve the problem of the two communities by peaceful means. These talks, however, came to a deadlock late last year. This as well as the present Cyprus crisis can be traced to a Nato conference held in Lisbon in June 1971. At this conference, a meeting between the Greek and Turkish delegations took place. Both sides admitted that Cyprus remained a source of friction between them and consequently a weakness in the southern flank of the Nato alliance. It was also common ground that this state of affairs was likely to endure as long as Makarios remained in power. They therefore agreed upon a formula which envisaged separate administration for the Turkish community, constituting 18 per cent of the population only, thus creating a state within a state, or a double union by dividing Cyprus between Greece and Turkey.

Once again Cyprus's answer was a negative one. This provoked the Greek junta leader, Papadopoulos, to send a letter to Makarios warning him that, if he did not give in, 'the Greek Government would feel the severe necessity of taking those measures which the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national interest dictated. . . .'

In September 1971, General George Grivas was sent to Cyprus in a bid to intimidate Makarios and stir up old feuds and antagonisms. Grivas, who is still on the island, living without pretence of concealment in the headquarters of the regular Greek Army battalion, just outside Nicosia, set about forming terrorist groups. Makarios wisely avoided a confrontation with the General, and instead tried to reinforce the National Guard by importing 15,000 Czechoslovak small arms. This made the Greek military regime realise Makarios was not prepared to betray his people, and forced them to show their true colours, thus disillusioning their few remaining fans in Cyprus who clamoured for Enosis, still believing in the grandeur of mother Greece. The Greek regime sent an ultimatum to Makarios demanding that he surrender the arms to the United Nations' peace keeping unit in Cyprus and form a government of 'national unity' including pro-Grivas elements and excluding the Communists. Makarios, at the time of writing, has not conceded to either demand. More pressure is being put on Makarios by three of his church colleagues, the bishops of Kyrenia, Paphos and Kitium, who at a recent Holy Synod meeting called on him to resign his temporal post.

The fourth Regular Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Committee of AKEL was convened on February 14 and declared that the Party of the Working People condemned the Athens ultimatum and believed that interference by Athens in the internal affairs of Cyprus encourages foreign intervention and pressures on the Cypriot people, thus damaging their own interests as well as those of Cyprus. A resolution adopted by the Plenum states clearly the AKEL policy on this issue: (1) AKEL unconditionally supports the Makarios Government for a decisive confrontation of conspiracies, prevention of *coup d'état* plans and the achievement of an acceptable solution; (2) AKEL makes all the support it can command available to the legal state, which is the only one entitled to keep armed forces for the defence and security of Cyprus; (3) it condemns any attempt to incite the National Guard and the police force against the Government; (4) AKEL believes that the Cypriots themselves are the only ones capable of finding a just and peaceful solution: in order to safeguard her rights, Cyprus should develop friendly relations with other countries, especially the non-aligned and socialist ones; (5) finally, AKEL appeals to all parties and organisations to unite and co-operate with President Makarios for the rescue of Cyprus.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

S. O. DAVIES (November 1886—February 25, 1972)

We mourn the death in his eighty-sixth year of S. O. Davies MP, courageous left-wing fighter and one of the oldest and most faithful of friends and supporters of this magazine. His contributions to *Labour Monthly* in the last thirty years included: *Press Freedom in Wartime* (1941), *Labour and War* (1950), *Labour and Rearmament* (1951), *Labour's New Fight* (1951), and *Signposts—or Windmills?* (1961). He was actually concerned in the preparation of an article for us as part of our feature *From Poplar to Merthyr* on the children's milk. But an attack of influenza in the first month of the year prevented our readers from seeing what would have been his last contribution, and death followed in the last week of February after he had rushed up to London to record his vote on February 21 against the Common Market. We print opposite an appreciation of his life and activities by one who was a friend of his for over fifty years.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COURAGEOUS LEADER

Robin Page Arnot

STEPHEN Owen Davies, born at Abercwmbol, near Aberdare, was a Welsh-speaking Welshman who spoke no English until he was 13. He came of four generations of colliers, and at the age of 12 started work at Cwmpennar Colliery in Mountain Ash. In the long history of British mining two outstanding figures matriculated to the university direct from the coalface. The first was Alexander McDonald (1821-81) whose 'brilliant leadership' of the miners led in 1874 to his becoming the first Labour representative in parliament. It was sixty years later that S. O. Davies entered the House of Commons. In 1898, when Stephen began work, the South Wales Miners' Federation came into being. Studying at night-school and at weekends Stephen won a place at University College, Cardiff, where he took his degree in Arts, and later qualified from the Royal College of Science. Already a member of the Independent Labour Party (and an organiser for it amongst the students) he returned to work at the coalface.

Elected checkweigher in 1913 Davies got a closer aquaintance with the Wages Agreement that then fettered the miners in South Wales. This largest of the coalfields had been notorious for the highest death rate and the longest hours of labour. Responsible for these fearful conditions was the Monmouthshire and South Wales Coal Owners' Association, in which the owners were tied to one another by an iron discipline against the workers with an extensive black-listing of employees at times of stoppage.

As a member of the ILP, imbued with the international socialist outlook and having lived through the extreme exploitation of the working class in that period, S.O. was already equipped beyond the average for those entering into leading positions in class struggle. 'S.O.' (as he was already called, and continued to be called to the end of his life) absorbed the lessons of the Russian revolution of November 1917. When in December 1918 he was elected miners' agent for Dowlais District of the SWMF he sprang immediately into prominence, and in the beginning of the revolutionary year 1919 S.O. was one of the few who realised there were opening up possibilities of a situation that could lead to a social revolution and he, in addition, carried forward and defended the drive for democracy not only within capitalism but particularly within the trade union movement

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in which so many of the South Wales leaders had already come to the fore.

At the crucial conference of the Miners' Federation (February 26, 1919), when it was suggested that the miners' demands on wages, hours of labour and for transfer of the mines to public ownership, which had gone to a strike ballot, should be referred to a Commission of Inquiry, S.O. put in an elequent defence of democracy, saying:

> It is a somersault. It is a going back. It is a volte-face upon the attitude we adopted at the Southport Conference (January 17, 1919). We must admit that. We have had a ballot. We recommended a ballot to our members, the people whom we presume to represent here. And the ballot has gone overwhelmingly along the lines which we recommended at the last Southport Conference. Today we are seeking ways and means to undermine that ballot.

Then he also warned the Conference about Lloyd George, 'the man who is trying to foist this Commission upon us', and pointed out that the Commission was proposed only because he (L.G.) could not make use, against the miners, of the Maxim guns and bayonets which he was employing against the strikers in Scotland and in Ireland. This passage of his speech concluded with the words: 'I do not think we should accept gifts from the Greeks.' In the end however the famous Sankey Commission was set up from which the miners received two-thirds of their wages demand and a seven-hour day (actually an eight-hour day) plus a promise of nationalisation of mines.

Two years later when wages had been cut down to half, and seven years later when the hours had been lengthened to a nominal eight (actually nine) there were some who remembered the warning that the young agent from Dowlais had uttered in that Conference in London.

During the lockout of 1921, S.O. responded with enthusiasm to the news of a conference in Moscow to form a Red International of Labour Unions: and a conference of the SWMF resolved that the Miners' Federation of Great Britain should join the RILU. In July 1922, S. O. Davies and Noah Ablett moved the motion which was defeated by a vote of all the other districts. This did not deter S.O. from carrying on the struggle on the lines laid down in the resolution from South Wales. In his own Dowlais District the decision was taken to send a delegation to the Second World Congress of the RILU due in the late autumn of 1922. S.O. himself was chosen as the miners' agent to be the District delegate, and obtained long leave of absence for this purpose.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic, where his worth and capabilities were immediately recognised, he was invited to write a textbook on mining. He was equipped for this task both by his technical studies which had brought him a mine manager's certificate and also by his experience in the industry both at the coalface and in dealing with the multifarious problems with which a miner's agent has to be familiar. S.O. for five months was in Russia going to one mining district after another so that he might so compile the textbook that it would fit into the special conditions of the old Tsarist coalfields.

Within his Dowlais District, S.O. used mass picketing to end non-unionism. As Vice-President (1924-32) and then as Chief Organiser of the SWMF he fought for a centralised democracy. Elected to the miners' national Executive Committee by a coalfield ballot (and re-elected regularly from 1924-34) he not only sustained the fight against class-collaboration policy but joined A. J. Cook and Arthur Horner from 1927 in campaigning to wipe out the yellow 'non-political' trade unions from the British coalfields.

At the beginning of 1934, as nominee of the SWMF, Davies stood for Merthyr Tydfil against opposition from Liberal, ILP and Communist candidates. His majority of 8,269 increased at the succeeding seven general elections, reaching over 22,000 in 1950. In parliament in the five years before the second world war S.O. fought against the Tory 'non-interventionists' in the cause of the Spanish peoples and supported left-wing policies against right-wing dominance in the leadership of the Labour Party, as well as in that of the TUC.

After the war when the policy of Ernest Bevin as British Foreign Secretary destroyed the possibility of united communist-socialist developments in the West of Europe as a preliminary to the acceptance in 1947 of the Marshall Plan and continued subservience to the US, S.O. fought bitterly. He was one of the 22 left-wing Labour MPs who signed a telegram of greetings and good wishes to the Pietro Nenni-and-Communist combination in the Italian parliamentary elections of 1948. He fought against the involvement of the United Nations (including the United Kingdom) in the American intervention in Korea. In 1953 he raised the question with the Prime Minister:

> In view of the widespread revulsion of feeling against the US in this country, if he would take steps to have the United States Embassy and Consulates here closed within four weeks: and all United States armed forces withdrawn forthwith from British soil.

While the Tory leader of the House in his reply angrily described the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assertion of 'the widespread revulsion of feeling against the US' as 'utterly without foundation', ex-Premier Attlee, anxious to show subservience to the US, rose in an attempt to rebuke S. O. Davies in parliament.

In November 1954, S.O. was one of the seven MPs who voted against the London and Paris Agreements whereupon, the Party whip withdrawn, he was excluded from the Party meetings in the House of Commons until 1955. In that year 1955 he introduced the Bill for a Parliament for Wales. In 1961 when the Labour front bench in its concealed coalition ('Butskellism') with the Tory Party supported the vote for swollen defence estimates, S.O. voted against: and for two years the parliamentary whip was withdrawn.

On every other major issue his was an uncompromising and courageous standpoint against the right-wing dominance of the Labour Party under its leaders Attlee, Gaitskell and Wilson. He was a thorn in their flesh. The retaliation was in these frequent exclusions from the Party meetings in the House of Commons, and finally, in a vicious attempt to oust him from parliament. They put up a rival candidate to him in Merthyr Tydfil in 1970.

The complicity of the Labour leadership in what had appeared as local intrigue was shown when his request for an inquiry into the Party's action was refused. The final answer was when their anti-Davies candidature was defeated (by over 7,000 votes) effortlessly with an election expenditure of £212, the lowest in the whole of the United Kingdom.

S.O. died in the week of the miners' victory ballot after their hard fought strike, the culmination for the time being of sixty years of struggle in which he had always been in the van, as a true and courageous leader in the coalfields.

LABOUR MONTHLY BOUND VOLUME FOR 1971

Price £2.90 post free, or send £1.30 and your loose copies to:

UNITY PUBLICATIONS (FINCHLEY) LTD
134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N3 2PD

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GUNTER

Alan Brown

SOME few years ago, when Ray Gunter was Minister of Labour, a group of newspaper correspondents sat with him at the Ministry discussing the then current problems in the industrial field. Not surprisingly, so far as the Government was concerned, they were much the same as the Tories are faced with today—how to damp down the wages movement. He sat there, framed by the twilight scene of St. James's Square, and went on at extraordinary length about the Communist Menace (wrecking the economy, fomenting strikes, etc.). He never, either then or subsequently, equalled Sir William (later Lord, now deceased) Carron's description of militant shop stewards as 'werewolves, rushing madly to industrial ruin and howling delightedly at the foam upon their muzzles, which they accepted as a guiding light' but his anti-Communist phrasing was as refined as you would come across amongst source books on the subject.

Coming down the corridor afterwards a kindly colleague confided that he had felt for me during the discussion. It was unfair of the Minister to push that line so hard, he said, knowing that the *Daily Worker* man was there. It was a friendly thought and, in an equally friendly way, I explained that I had not been in the least embarrassed since I knew that the Minister didn't believe a word of it, and what was more he knew that I knew. But he was clearly puzzled by this, finding the concept difficult to accept. Which, of course, indicates the object of the exercise, since anti-Communism can only retain any value as a political commodity so long as it can be sold as a true bill of goods.

Ray Gunter became somewhat notorious later that year (1967) for his denunciation of a Communist Plot in the docks. There was, he said, little doubt that the Party was 'plotting a winter of disruption' in alliance with Trotskyists, aiming 'to destroy our hopes of economic recovery and thereby . . . to bring ruin to the Social Democratic Movement.'

Whether his resignation (sent from distant South Africa) of the Labour Party whip, and his resigning his seat, means that he is leaving the social democratic movement or not is probably a theoretical question, but it is intriguing to consider how close some of his statements during the last Labour Government approximate to those of Edward Heath during his recent broadcast following the miners'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

victory. Talking about dockers' pickets in 1967 he said there was 'a viciousness about some of the thugs most active in leading unofficial action that is alien to our tradition'; two years later at an Industrial Society lunch, referring to a 'tiny but powerful handful of trade union leaders' he declared that 'in this age the power that is in the hands of a few must be contained by a framework of law in the interests of the nation as a whole.'

He once told us all to 'dismiss this tripe about the class war', saying he was blessed if he knew where one class began and the other ended. No doubt his resignation should also be seen in the light of that illuminating fact. And we can afford a wry smile from the comment, at the time he joined Robert Carr as a director of Securicor, of Managing Director Keith Erskine: 'We are a non-political organisation. Mr Gunter's appointment strikes a balance.'

Ray Gunter is leaving the scene, whether or not to go back to 'those from whence he came' or not we shall no doubt see. But sterile anti-Communism remains as a weapon in the hands of those who want to see the labour movement continue the divisions of the past, weakening its fight against the Tories and employers in the vital years that lie ahead.

The bans and proscriptions are being gradually whittled away (the recent decision to take the Labour Research Department from the ban list is a welcome further step) and with the general turn to the left of the rank-and-file, the job of the anti-Communist becomes more difficult. No doubt all the Communists concerned in the miners' strike played their full part—but he would have been a foolish man who would have alleged that a 'Communist Plot' was involved. Not many years ago such a magnificently-fought battle would have been a sure target for the 'plot' treatment—as we saw at the time of the seamen's dispute.

The role of the Ray Gunters gets more difficult. The 'bed of nails gets sharper, as it becomes more difficult to make the Red under it look convincing. Rent-a-Plot is nearly in the hands of the Receiver. Perhaps the truth is that the harsh issues are becoming more the stuff of politics, and people are less easily diverted from their goal by tales of mystery and imagination from the hoary old anti-Red manual.

Perhaps indeed now is a good time for Ray Gunter to withdraw.

Full time students will be interested in the special concession on *Labour Monthly* subscription rates. See inside back cover for details and subscription form.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY OR INDUSTRIAL TRAINING?

Stan Broadbridge*
President
Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions

IT is a truism that, in spite of all the gains won by the working class in the educational field, British education remains class divided. Nowhere is this more true than in the education of young people between 16 and 18 years of age. The rich, of course, have the direct-grant and miscalled public schools with all the privileges this entails and, especially, access to Oxford and Cambridge. Even in the state system, however, there is a clear division between those who continue in full-time education to 18 and then to university and those who leave at the end of compulsory schooling or soon after. The first group are still overwhelmingly the children of middle class parents, the second the working class youngsters, and the division between the two has no basis in potential ability. Moreover for the majority of those who leave school at an earlier age there is no continued education.

In 1969 (the last year for which there were detailed figures) only 40 per cent of boys under 18 and only 10 per cent of girls were receiving release from work to continue their education. This in itself is bad enough, especially when it is realised that it is concentrated in certain 'good' industries, but, although the percentages have improved since 1962 (from 30 per cent and 7½ per cent), this is merely because the numbers in the age group are less. In absolute terms there has been a *fall* in the numbers released, and such figures as are available for 1970 show the beginning of a fall in the percentage.

The social importance of this cannot be stressed too strongly—and especially of the sex bias. Most of the girls released were in a few trades, usually at merely 'operative' levels (e.g. in hairdressing) with no prospects of further educational progress. Between them and their more fortunate sisters in the upper forms of secondary schools there develops an ever-widening gap of educational opportunity, which needs no stressing, but which certainly calls for action.

To the Government and to industry, however, the problem is mainly one of adequate training to provide industry's man-power.

* Stan Broadbridge writes here in individual capacity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was for this reason that the then Tory Government passed the Industrial Training Act in 1964 so that firms could be encouraged to provide training in the necessary skills. The cost was met from a fund provided in each industry from a levy on firms, so that the more a firm trained the more it received back. From the beginning the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions pointed out that the Act was too weak to achieve its purposes, and this has been borne out by events. Many firms, especially small ones, merely pay the levy and pass the costs on to the consumer, while the others have tended to carry on as before. Since they cannot claim for training unless there is associated with it release for further education the figures already given show that there has been no advance in numbers. These figures should be contrasted with the proposals of the Henniker-Heaton report, also in 1964, that the numbers released should be doubled within five years. One basic weakness is that the Act is so worded that the levy cannot be punitive; very largely the amount of training done determines the levy instead of the levy being fixed at a level that will enforce training.

Nevertheless, it is probable that the scheme—which has involved some (though far too few) trade unionists and teachers on the training boards for each industry—has made some improvement in the quality of training. Even that, however, has been too much for much of industry, and as soon as this Tory Government was returned it began to dismantle the Act. New boards in the pipeline were postponed; there were rumours of closures, and attempts were made to raise the exemption limits, based on size of firm, in several boards.

The latest step in this direction is a discussion document of the Department of Employment, *Training for the Future*, which recommends the ending of the levy grant system, on the basis that there has been 'a major change in the attitude of large sections of British industry to systematic training'—a shift that is far from obvious in the figures. It would be replaced by a system of 'selective financial support' where training is inadequate to meet the needs of industry as a whole—the so-called 'key training activities'—the boards otherwise concentrating on advising and encouraging firms to develop training.

All training and retraining would come under the control of a new National Training Agency, which would in addition provide such funds as the boards needed from central sources. It would also administer a new 'Training Opportunities Scheme', designed, it is claimed, to meet the needs of individuals. This will apparently be concerned mainly with retraining (since no one will be permitted to enter the scheme until at least three years after completing full-time

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

education), which will take place on a full-time basis. The aim would be 100,000 in full-time training as soon as possible, but 60-70,000 by 1975, as compared with 17,000 last year. Of these 30,000 would be in Government training centres, the rest in existing institutions such as colleges of further education. Financial support for trainees would be on the basis of allowances which will be better than unemployment benefit and which, it is claimed, will make it possible for a mature worker to give up his job and maintain his family. The scheme will be 'marketed' on a voluntary basis through the employment service. The annual cost is expected to rise to £60 million, as compared with a total disbursed under the levy/grant system of £203 million.

The net effect is to take a considerable financial burden from industry (the levy) in the hope that they will continue to spend the same amount of money on training. If they do, the cost will presumably be passed on to the consumer, but it is far from certain that they will. In return a much smaller sum will come from public funds—i.e. from a tax system which is being 'reformed' to place much less burdens on industry and the rich. This, it is hoped, can be used to encourage 100,000 each year to undergo full-time training.

Even if the scheme were successful, however, it would still be inadequate. There is no doubt that, as automation develops even further, there will be an increasing need for 'permanent education', for people to return to the education system. This, in itself, may easily require the 100,000 places. In addition, however, there is need for increased education for our young people, the majority of whom would still be left untouched by the scheme, since nearly 400,000 of them enter industry each year. No mention is made of measures to increase the amount of part-time education, but this is clearly an essential first step. The emphasis is all on the needs of industry and on training as opposed to education.

The minimum basis that must be laid is compulsory release for education to the age of 18 as a first step to further raising the age of compulsory education. In fact the whole matter must be seen as educational, firmly under the control of the Department of Education and Science *not* the Department of Employment (though the DES would have to be altered in the process!) and with proper representation of teachers and students. Young people should be based on educational institutions and released to industry, rather than the reverse. The education of young people in industry must not be seen as a separate issue. As long as the educational system remains class divided these will be the youngsters who have had the poorest deal; the aim of the educational system must be to overcome this. For this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason the colleges and institutions in which they receive their part-time education must not be separated from those to which their more fortunate contemporaries are sent—the polytechnics and universities. They must all be part of one unified system of post-school education, part-time and full-time, in which all doors are opened, so that, no matter where a youngster starts, he can proceed as far as he wishes, transfering from one institution to another and from part- to full-time education. This will, of course, require more public control of universities as well as more unified financing, but without it we shall continue to have a stratified system—the universities (and polytechnics) for the middle classes and inadequate part-time training for the rest. That is what Carr and his like want to see; that is what we must fight to destroy.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS (2)

Academician E. K. Fedorov

(*The first part of this article appeared in our March issue*—Ed. *LM*)

INDUSTRIAL technology can be changed so as to form closed production cycles, eliminating waste discharges into the environment. Moreover, many valuable substances, wasted now, will be saved and put to efficient uses. Such methods call for immense financial outlays as many branches of industry will have to be reconstructed.

It is appropriate to mention that the industry manufacturing nuclear products, as well as the atomic power stations, is run in a much 'purer' way than any of the segments of the chemical industry. The functional 'purity' is the result of appropriate measures having been taken at the very outset of production so as to eliminate even chance discharges of radioactive wastes into the environment, despite the relatively high cost of such measures.

We should not neglect the fact that a substantial measure of pollution of the environment is caused by war. Preparation of war itself, as is well known, results in unintentional cases of pollution, e.g. during nuclear weapons tests, losses of nuclear bombs, and the leakage of chemical warfare agents. The use of chemical warfare agents by the US armed forces in Vietnam, according to the findings of an authoritative panel of US experts, is responsible for the destruction of up to 25 per cent of the total forest area of South Vietnam. Chemical warfare in Indo-China has taken a heavy toll of human

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lives and sufferings. No industrial pollution could match the harm and grief thus caused! We all realise full well the dire consequences for mankind and the environment of radioactive contamination from a global thermonuclear conflict.

The warming up of the environment, a by-product of any industrial activity, is also an important factor meriting as much attention as the pollution problem. The heat produced by industry and given off to the ambient atmosphere constitutes now 0.81 per cent of the heat received by the Earth from the Sun. The proportion of man-made heat, however, is constantly growing, and one might assume that in some 50-60 years it will reach one or two per cent; this will raise the temperature of the lower strata of the atmosphere by one or two degrees (C) on the average throughout the planet.

Land irrigation, that is being used on an ever growing scale the world over, results in water cycle changes throughout the entire surface. Irrigation increases evaporation on the continents and decreases the discharge of rivers into the oceans. This too, might affect our climate.

Some experiments aimed at effecting artificial changes in the course of certain natural phenomena have, as is known, had a definite margin of success. Hail control techniques have been successfully developed and tested in the Soviet Union. Stimulation of precipitations is becoming more and more successful in a number of countries and already clouds can be dispersed. Our colleagues in the United States are busy developing hurricane suppression methods. All these methods of influencing meteorological phenomena are based on the instability of the latter, and the possibility of inducing self-developing reactions in the atmosphere. So far, scientists have succeeded in stimulating and inducing such reactions on a local scale. But it is quite conceivable that large-scale processes that take place in the atmosphere, and are responsible for the creation of a definite climate, may go through an unstable stage.

The climate of the globe is known to have undergone several substantial changes throughout geological history, some of which are known to have occurred within the past twenty-thirty thousand years. These differences cannot be explained just by the shifts in the location of the continents and oceans, the displacement of the slope of the Earth's axis and other similar factors. No theory of climatic changes has so far been evolved, but a number of weighty arguments have been advanced to prove the climate's instability. If confirmed, the discovery would imply both positive and negative consequences for humanity. They would be positive in as much as the discovery

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would give rise to hopes that in the future the climate could be improved by man so as to suit his needs in the best possible way. They would be negative in so far as the changes in climate, however unwelcome, might occur spontaneously regardless of man's interests.

Changes in the state of the Earth's surface, such as, for instance, the destruction of the ice-coating of the polar oceans, and a number of others, might trigger off changes in the climate-forming processes and upset the existing natural balances. There is good ground for believing that a rise in the average temperature of the atmosphere by one or two degrees might trigger off some of the climate changing processes.

The assertions of the fantastic power man possesses due to scientific and technological progress and the growth of production means have already become commonplace. The methods of man's influence upon nature described above feature only some of his capabilities which include his ability to plan and effect actions whereof the scope is comparable with global natural processes and even exceeds them.

Let it be noted that in any organism created by nature will be found, along with its ability to effect certain actions, the means of rendering them not only harmless, but also expedient, according to the needs of the organism and its entire species. More or less reliable adjustment and preventive devices and systems are an inalienable organic part of every piece of machinery made by man. They are inherent in any organised system, be it a peasant's farm, an industrial or commercial enterprise, a bank or a country's economy run by an overall economic plan in a socialist state. But modern humanity in its totality has no such organised system; it has no adjustment machinery to control its most essential parts in general, and environment affecting actions, in particular.

In my view, that is where the main danger lies. It was Karl Marx who first defined the danger over one hundred years ago, when he wrote in one of his letters: 'Culture, if it develops spontaneously without being willfully oriented, leaves behind a desert.' One can hardly describe the problem we are concerned with in a more laconic and precise way.

Can one determine a time after which the spontaneous development of society will become intolerable? I believe that the following rather small considerations can help us to make a very approximate assessment of that landmark. As has been pointed out, we shall approach the full use of the natural increment of some of our natural resources in 50-70 years. By the same time we might expect indust trial heat to reach values that could affect the climate. Man's impac-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on nature and the efficient use of natural resources are very much in the minds of many scientists and prominent political figures. Some of the scientists in the West give thought to the future development of mankind. I have in mind Forrester in the United States, Paccei in Italy and others.

Forrester tries to apply, for instance, systems analysis techniques for studying the problem of mankind's future. He brings together all the basic aspects of human activities: population growth, mortality rates, the use of natural resources, the contamination of the environment, the cost-effect analysis, and many others. By using various methods to assess the numerical values of the interrelationships among these phenomena, he forecasts through complicated computerised data the future state of society. . . . The findings he has published are anything but optimistic. If civilisation proceeds along the development patterns it has been following during the past decades, we shall reach a maximum population saturation point, according to Forrester, somewhere close to 2030. Ecological pollution will reach by that time disastrous proportions; the natural resources will be depleted; the mortality rate, as a result, will sharply increase, so that population will decrease by 4-5 times during the 20-30 years that will follow the crisis.

Other versions of the calculations forecast less catastrophic consequences and situations. But all of them predict a certain crisis for humanity in some 50-70 years from now when the depletion of resources and ecological pollution will bring forth sharp declines in population sizes.

Forrester and his colleagues insist upon the necessity of passing over from development to a state of stability, they believe that further industrialisation should be stopped, and especially so in the developing countries; they insist upon the wisdom of family planning. This is the main message Forrester's work carries.

I have referred here to Forrester's investigations not because I agree with his findings. The interrelationship values he defines among various social development phenomena are open to doubt and can be disproved, and that will upset the entire train of his thinking and reasoning. Why should we consider the snowballing of pollution an inevitable evil when even now we possess means for its prevention? We can foresee with good reason that even higher rates of economic growth would be both feasible and acceptable in the future in view of the breakthroughs affecting the use of natural resources.

Forrester's calculations serve their purpose as illustrations of the results of the spontaneous, not man-oriented, development of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

civilisation Marx referred to. Moreover, a catastrophic state might set in much earlier than predicted by Forrester if we allow a war to begin, or become even more devastating at a later date as an after-effect of the possible unfavourable climatic changes.

The ideas presented above prove, in my view, the necessity of changing the spontaneously developing culture into one whose progress in consciously directed by man. The first step towards this goal is the cessation of the arms race and disarmament—these will be the sources making it possible to reconstruct industry as a No. 1 priority which will eliminate pollution; the reconstruction will be followed by the initiation of large-scale natural resources cultivation programmes.

Only given the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems and their close co-operation will it be possible to effect the necessary adjustment of man's activities *vis-à-vis* his natural surroundings and the transformation of the latter on a global scale for the good of humanity as a whole. Only with these prerequisites shall we be able to define the long-range prospect of our progress and its objectives, and I wish to stress that I mean progress and not some state of freeze in the life of human society.

VIETNAM—CRUCIAL STAGE

William J. Pomeroy

AT several points in the decade or more of open US aggression in Indo-China the war has reached critical stages. For the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia it has meant the heroic surmounting of one crisis after another—the unrestricted American bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the invasions of Cambodia and Laos, the strategic hamlet 'pacification', Operation Phoenix, defoliation—and the turning of all crises into US disasters that have been adding up to a strategic defeat for American policy.

In a number of respects, the present period may well be the most critical of all. With victory literally in sight, the Indo-Chinese peoples are having to contend with a dangerous US counter-offensive of intrigues, trickery and half-hidden escalation of savage military operations, designed to turn that victory into ashes.

American imperialism, far from having shot its bolt in Indo-China, is involved in a complex set of manoeuvres aimed not only at off-setting defeat but at gaining certain advantages out of the circum-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stances in which it has been occurring. One of its tactics has been to blind and to hoodwink the unprecendeted international forces of protest that had developed against this most barbarous of all wars of aggression. The Nixon administration has sought to do this with its 'Vietnamisation' policy, its alleged 'winding down of the war', its 'changing the colour of the corpses', its pretence at peace talks in Paris.

Undoubtedly, Nixon believes he has had a degree of success. In withdrawing the bulk of US ground forces, in stemming the flow of dead and maimed American boys back to horrified US communities, in pretending to negotiate, he has seen the relative disappearance from American and world streets of massive demonstrations against the war.

'Vietnamisation', however, has not at all meant the end of the war or of direct US aggression. American military operations have instead merely been shifted from the visible TV-recorded ground war by American troops to the far less visible air war and new sophisticated military technology that embody less American troops lost but infinitely greater devastation.

The true Nixon policy is visible in the statistics of death. In the three years since he was elected with a pledge to 'wind down the war', Nixon has spent $67,200 million for war in Indo-China. The destruction and death in that period has exceeded the ghastly tolls of the Kennedy and Johnson years. From 1969-71 over seven million tons of explosives, including three million tons of bombs, have rained down chiefly upon South Vietnam, more than the total dropped by the US in the second world war and the Korean war combined.

Ecological effects of millions of bomb craters that, taken together, cover an area equivalent to 371,400 acres have scarcely been assessed, and this is being augmented at an increasing rate by the 15,000 pound BLU-82/B 'Daisy Cutter' bomb, perfected under Nixon, each of which obliterates life over an area of 776 acres. Furthermore, shrapnel that wrecks vegetation has been spread over 28.6 million acres.

Toxic chemicals, during the 1969-71 period, were sprayed over 4.5 million acres of forests and fields, affecting 790,000 people, of whom thousands have died. The National Liberation Front estimates that 20 per cent of South Vietnam has been devastated in this manner, but even if the 14 per cent admitted in US Senate documents is accepted it would embrace a territory equivalent, proportionately, to the US region covered by Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky and Arkansas.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Nixon's three years, over 3,000 hamlets in South Vietnam, 26 per cent of the total, have been leveled by bombs, chemicals and bulldozers, their millions of inhabitants driven into concentration camps. The US 'pacification campaign' manager, W. Colby, admitted in April 1971 that there had been 5,800,000 civilian casualties and displaced persons in South Vietnam; in 1971 alone there were 125,000 civilian casualties, one-third being children below the age of 13.

Vietnamese troops of the Saigon regime of Nguyen Van Thieu, to whom the war is allegedly being handed over, account for the lesser portion of this enravagement, which is mainly the work of the high-flying out-of-sight B-52s and of the new 'electronic battlefield' techniques that substitute remote automated fire-power for man-power. In the latter system large areas are gridded and sown with electronic devices that trigger off massive artillery or air bombardments for every detected movement of a living thing, soldier or civilian, woman or child, or mere farm animal. As a witness, a Mr Herter, testified at an Investigating Conference of Vietnam Veterans, held in Detroit in February 1971: 'The people become dots of light on infrared film. They are never seen, never known, never hated. The machine functions, the area is bombed, the radar blips disappear.'

'Vietnamisation' is thus revealed as a monstrous deception to hide the escalation of murderous technology still operated by the 'residual force' of Americans. For the Vietnamese people, and for the peoples of Laos and Cambodia who are similarly affected, the deception has posed a critical problem in the crucial period of forcing the US to negotiate seriously an end to the war, since it has to a considerable extent had a muting effect on the international anti-war movement that has been the indispensable ally of the Indo-Chinese peoples.

Of major importance, therefore, was the World Assembly for the Peace and Independence of the Indo-Chinese Peoples, held in Versailles on the weekend of February 11-13, which brought together 1,200 delegates from 84 countries and focused on stripping away Nixon's deceptive mask of 'Vietnamisation' or of 'winding down the war'. As the biggest international conference against the US aggression yet held, it showed that the mask has certainly slipped and that large numbers of people are revolted at what is revealed and are again stirring in protest. An hysterical tirade by the US ambassador to the Paris peace talks, William Porter, who attacked the Versailles meeting as a 'horde of agitators', and used it as an excuse to cancel a session of the peace talks, indicated the Nixon sensitivity to exposure.

The World Assembly called for a renewed international campaign

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in co-ordination with the activities of the anti-war movement in the United States, which include an initial six-week period of demonstrations, marches and lobbyings, from April 1 to May 15, leading into the American presidential election campaign. It centres on the demand for a specific terminal date for complete US withdrawal from Indo-China of all US ground, air, naval and technician personnel, without any conditions whatsoever, and on the widest possible information campaign on the nature of the new barbarous stage of the war. The British Council for Peace in Vietnam sent a delegation of over 40 to Versailles, the majority from trade unions, and the World Assembly's appeal that they brought back is now being disseminated to help re-energise the powerful protest against US aggression that has been heard on past occasions in this country.

American manoeuvres under Nixon extend, however, far beyond the escalation techniques of 'Vietnamisation'. As the sabotaged peace talks with the DRV and the PRG in Paris are stretched out, and as the war is intensified, the Nixon administration is extremely busy setting up the arrangements in Asia through which it hopes to contain the effects of the Indo-Chinese peoples' struggle. Talk of 'falling dominos' in South East Asia is no longer heard. The military regimes propped up in Thailand and Indonesia, the five-power military pact centred on Malaysia and Singapore obligingly put together by the British Tory Government, the increasing repressive policies encouraged in the Philippines, the hatching of a new policeman's role for Japan in Asia—these are all features of a neo-colonial US 'withdrawal' from Vietnam.

The victory of the Indo-Chinese peoples is not a decided issue. They and their friends in the world face a most critical period in the campaign to halt the new and more vicious stage of the war now occurring.

Labour Monthly Bound Volumes

Our price list is available on enquiry
Have you ordered your volume for 1971
at the reduced price?

See page 172

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

The Economic, Social and Cultural Human Rights in the German Democratic Republic

Professor Bernhard Graefrath
The GDR Committee on Human Rights (Central Books), 80 pp., 10p

THE WHOLE FIELD of human rights inevitably presents strong contrasts between capitalist and socialist states, with their fundamentally different outlooks and economies, and it is remarkable and in some ways encouraging that the United Nations General Assembly has managed to agree not just once but twice on something like a code on the subject: once, in 1948, on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and again, in 1966, on the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

No state fulfils perfectly all the obligations created by these documents, but on some of the most vital ones the capitalists fail badly, of course accompanying their failure by loud propaganda blasts to the effect that there are no human rights in socialist states! (This must rank high even among all the long list of such libels, for a few moments' thought should convince anyone that perhaps the most vital of all human rights the right to work—in developed countries especially—can never be fully realised, except occasionally by accident, in a capitalist state, whilst any socialist state could scarcely fail to fulfil it if it wanted to!) But it is very useful at this stage in history to be provided with a scholarly exposition of the position in one state, the German Democratic Republic. This pamphlet, published by the GDR Committee on Human Rights, contains a short philosophic treatise on the whole topic, followed by a synopsis, occupying more than half of the whole pamphlet, in which all the provisions of the Covenant of 1966 are taken one by one, and it is then shown in detail exactly how the constitution and the legislation of the Republic set out to make a reality of the rights set out in the Covenant.

This pamphlet is not for light reading, but sociologists and lawyers, and others who seek to know the truth, will find it extremely interesting and valuable.

D. N. PRITT

Democracy at Gunpoint: The Greek Front

Andreas Papandreou
André Deutsch, 338 pp., £3.30

ANDREAS PAPANDREOU recounts developments in Greece up to the fascist military coup of 1967, as he saw them, and gives extremely valuable testimony as a bourgeois politician of the responsibility of the imperialist countries for all Greece has suffered. He begins with Britain's role in 1944 recalling that 'the British instructed the commanders of British units to harbour and protect the men of the Security Battalions—the collaborationist armed detachments notorious for their criminal action against Greek patriots,' and followed this with armed intervention, the restoration of an unpopular monarchy and the beginnings of civil war. Evidence is given in abundance of US domination which meant direct control by the Americans of everything, from choice of Prime Ministers (Allen Dulles himself picked Caramanlis for Prime Minister) and electoral systems, to 'strict wages discipline'. The extensive activities of the CIA are exposed often from personal experience. For example, when Papandreou conveyed his father's views on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an electoral system proposed by the Americans to Laughlin Campbell, the CIA Chief in Greece, he retorted: 'Go tell your father that in Greece we get our way. We can do what we want and stop at nothing.' The facts are given on the positions held in the CIA, or its Greek counterpart KYP, by George Papadopoulos and the others involved in the 1967 coup, on the role of the US Military Mission and the Nato Plan used. Included in this and other gripping material is a section on Cyprus which gives a background to the present threat by Nato and the Greek fascists to the island's independence today. The final chapter, 'Prospect', reveals the contradiction between all that has gone before and some of the conclusions Papandreou draws. He puts the US and the USSR on a par in the world today and expresses the belief that 'the Europeans' will assert their independence in a process 'which involves not only western but eastern Europe', and that 'Europe can stand on its own feet and confront the two superpowers only as a united continent.' What he forgets is that, together with the US, it is the so-called Western European democracies which, through loans, investments and the military support of Nato, are helping to keep the junta in power today. The policy of fighting on two fronts—against the right and against the left—proved disastrous for Mr George Papandreou and for Greece. Mr Andreas Papandreou's version of this—the policy of fighting against the 'two superpowers', against the socialist countries as against imperialism—would, if it were followed by the democratic antidictatorship forces, rob the Greek people of their best allies, the socialist countries and the international democratic and working class movement.

BETTY AMBATIELOS

Politics and the Stages of Growth
W. W. Rostow
Cambridge University Press, 410 pp., £1.60

I SUPPOSE it is some indication of the mess that social science is in that one should find oneself giving half a welcome to a new book by Walt Whitman Rostow, written after he returned to academic life, with freshly stoked-up anti-communist bias and belief in 'the glory' of America's 'transcendent political mission', after several years as an advisor to the US State Department. The fact is that he has written in a field which others must be challenged to enter if social science is to make progress.

Many economists, political scientists and sociologists could be got to agree nowadays that they should get together to produce a multi-disciplinary approach to problems like, say, the development of backward countries. But most academics don't get beyond that point. Rostow here attempts to relate political change to his own well-known view of economic and social change. This involves five stages of a country's development—traditional society, 'the preconditions for take-off', 'take-off', 'the drive to maturity', the age of high mass consumption. It also involves the notion of a sequence of leading sectors propelling the economy forward. The trouble is that Rostow's stages have so little of analytical significance in them that the discussion becomes little more than a potted summary of already well-known landmarks in the history of a selected list of countries. No great contribution to theory emerges, though quite a number of interesting details of the inter-connections between political and economic history are set out. Significantly the book is at its weakest when it attempts to discuss present-day under-developed countries, since here the analytical and predictive

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

uselessness of its framework becomes most glaring. This is to say nothing of the book's political bias which becomes more and more pronounced the nearer it gets to those aspects of post-war international relations of most concern to the American State Department.

Rostow has a useful discussion in an appendix by way of a critique of the work of modern academic social theorists. His criticisms are cogent, though his answers don't get us very far. The great challenge of all this (not of course stated by Rostow) is to Marxists to demonstrate the power of their own dynamic theory of social change. Sweeping generalisations and Cook's Tours round the world won't do. The need is for detailed studies of the class structure, the relations of production, the history, the culture, the motivations of governments of separate countries in the context of their international relationships. In the rigorous working out of the linkages between economic, political and social change Marxists need not fear that any modern school of academics has beaten them to it. But they nevertheless have a lot of work to do themselves.

P. F. LEESON

Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America

Andre Gunder Frank
Pelican Latin American Library,
368 pp., 55p

For the Liberation of Brazil, Carlos Marighela, 192 pp., 30p; **The Twenty Latin Americas: vols. 1 & 2,** Marcel Niedergang, 416 and 388 pp., 60p each; **Guatemala—Another Vietnam?** Thomas and Marjorie Melville, 310 pp., 55p

PLOUGHING THROUGH the tangles of trendy economic verbiage with which this book is liberally laced is a difficult and not very rewarding task. The author has chosen Chile and Brazil as subjects for analysis of economic developments, and his main thesis is that all sections of their economy, including what are normally thought of as feudal or semi-feudal, and including even the primitive tribes, are 'fully integrated' into the capitalist system. The proof is a very tedious process, but what matters are his conclusions drawn on the basis of this proof: (1) Capitalism extends to all sections of the economy; (2) Since the historical role of the national bourgeoisie is to extend capitalism and complete the bourgeois democratic revolution the national bourgeoisie is now obsolete; (3) Therefore, co-operation with the national bourgeoisie is 'politically disastrous' and 'treacherous or treachery'. I think the author imagines that the Latin American communist parties are guilty of this approach; and, if so, he is very wrong.

In the essay on Chile, he explicitly attacks the programme adopted by Salvadore Allende when he was defeated in the 1964 Presidential election (the book was written before the recent successful election), as merely reforms within capitalism and, as a solution to underdevelopment, 'inadequate and unacceptable'.

The author is at least clear in his statements that capitalism is the cause of underdevelopment and that socialism is the only system which can offer a way out. But faced with a situation such as exists in Chile, what true socialist would reject active participation and co-operation in a broad front led by a man such as Allende, not as solution to all problems, but as a first and exciting step which should provide a basis for further progress.

It is very easy to be drawn into generalising about what should be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

done and what is possible in Latin America. Although the countries do have common problems, their roads to development must be different, and what is right in one country is likely to be quite wrong in another. The author is guilty of this in drawing his conclusions about futile co-operation with the national bourgeoisie from two such different situations as exist in Chile and Brazil. I'm sure he is wrong in the case of Chile. He is probably right regarding the situation as it exists *at present* in Brazil, where a filthy dictatorship answers each progressive deed, word or thought with brutal repression. But the revolutionaries working in Brazil will change the situation there, and with each change, small or large, peaceful or violent, new possibilities for action will emerge.

It is basically a disagreement on tactics. When the author states '. . . though the principal enemy undoubtedly is imperialism, the immediate enemy is the national bourgeoisie in Latin America itself', he is ignoring that the progressive forces can only accomplish what they are strong enough to accomplish, and it is action to achieve seemingly limited aims which builds up strength for battles to come.

For the Liberation of Brazil is a collection of writings by Carlos Marighela, a member of the Brazilian Communist Party for forty years, who left his Party in 1967 to form an urban guerrilla organisation, and was shot and killed by police in 1969. His long association with the Party has left him with the knowledge of the vital importance of mass movements, but his endeavour to link the building of such movements with his new theories leads him to the idea that 'the masses will coalesce round the fire power' of small, secret bands of armed men who, apart from the usual guerrilla tactics, will flit like wraithes through the political scene organising and conjuring up strikes and demonstrations, but always remaining anonymous and unidentified.

The Twenty Latin Americas, by Marcel Niedergang, is undoubtedly the best buy of this first set of five from Pelican Latin American Library. General political and economic solutions and a brief history of each of the twenty countries' vicissitudes of government are given, and although the style is a bit gossipy anyone even slightly concerned with events in this area will find a wealth of useful and interesting material.

Guatemala—Another Vietnam? is a carefully written, fully documented indictment of the United States and the CIA in their so-far successful attempts to keep the Banana Republic a home fit for the United Fruit Company to make its profits in. Thomas and Marjorie Melville, a priest and a nun, expelled from that country in 1967 for active sympathy with the landless peasants, bring home the facts loud and clear.

MARGARET GOODWIN

Conversations with Allende

Régis Debray

New Left Books, 190 pp., £1.05

THIS IS A SURPRISING BOOK, but not for the reasons that trendy critics of revolution will advance. It is true that the author has moved away from his original position, articulated most strongly in *Revolution in the Revolution* (Monthly Review Press, *NLB*). In his earlier book, the author advanced a theory of guerrilla struggle known as the 'Foco Theory'. This theory had a group of revolutionaries going off into the hills of Latin America, and, by a series of daring military attacks on the armed forces of the state, triggering a revolutionary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upsurge, which coalesces into a guerrilla army which can seize power. Turning Marxist-Leninist guerrilla theory and experience on its head, the author argued for the primacy of military struggle to political struggle, military leadership above political leadership, and for separation of the foco from the masses (in order to protect both from armed counter-attack). Some publishers claimed that Debray's foco theory was the official theory of the Cuban revolutionary government, and Debray didn't deny this. The whole consequence of this inane piece of work was to send to death many communists and non-communists who thought they were following profound insights of the Cuban leadership (the case of Hugo Blanco in Peru or Marighella in Brazil come to mind).

Essentially, one would think that the author, if he is indeed changing his position, would make a thorough going self-criticism of his earlier position. Considering that that position led directly to the death of many people, one might also expect a little humility, a little caution on the part of the author. However, we see again another petty-bourgeois intellectual who dabbles in positions and theories, precisely because, like others of his genre, he thinks they have no bad or fatal consequences. This is not what one sees in this book. Although Debray allows Allende much space for his views, and for a chance to elaborate on this particular path for Latin America and Chile, he prefaces the work with a long introduction in which he emphasises the incomprehensibleness of what is happening in Chile (incomprehensible only to him and other sectarian model builders). He says he is trying to 'grasp an ungraspable situation', an 'incomprehensible, irritating, even disturbing' situation. Why is the situation so? Debray doesn't say, but it doesn't take much reflection to understand that Chile is not following the foco theory at all. As Allende says: 'The lesson is that each country has its own particular circumstances, and it is in the light of those circumstances that one must act. There is no set formula. Our case, for example, opens up possibilities. It shows a way. We have arrived through the polling booths. Apparently it can be said of us that we are mere reformers, but we have taken measures which imply we want to bring about the revolution, that is to transform society, and that in turn means building the socialist society.'

Debray, throughout his interview finds this difficult to understand. Continually, he attempts to pose the Cuban road against the Chilean road, certifying the former as revolutionary, the latter, full of dangers of reformism.

Generally, Debray's questions, his concluding the work with a long critique by the Chilean ultra-left of the Communist and Socialist parties and of the Popular Unity, and his preface, reflect the fact that he has not truly overturned his old ideas. He does not yet understand the many roads to revolution that are possible in a world where the balance of forces has decisively shifted to socialism. For this reason, the book is largely a response by Allende to ultra-left criticism. For this reason, perhaps, it will be valuable to many who face these sorts of arguments in their everyday work, and in ideological struggle. Allende's answers are those of a mature Marxist who understands the necessity and the power of mass struggle. It is also a good illustration of the general failing of the ultra-left, in that it exposes the irrelevance of their approaches to the problems of making a real revolution.

ALLEN SILVERSTONE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Short History of Soviet Society
V. Lelchuk, Y. Polyakov, A. Protopopov
Progress Publishers (*Central Books*), 446 pp., 90p

THIS IS ANOTHER welcome addition to the series of Soviet historical works for the general reader, written in a modern style. One distinguishing feature is the attention it gives to the difficulties arising at every stage—often out of the successful application of earlier decisions, and therefore previously unforeseen—and how they were overcome. But above all it is what its title says: a history of the Soviet *people* at work, building a new life, during the years since the October revolution of 1917. Histories written by bourgeois writers—when they are not collections of horrors and stupidities which make you wonder how the Soviet Union has ever got to where it is today—are only too prone to make them the story of the fights between leaders and struggles within the Communist Party, with a huge mass of faceless and docile baa-lambs surrounding them and waiting for the outcome. This book is an emphatic correction to that trend. It also corrects the presently fashionable device of presenting affairs in the Soviet Union as decided by a soulless 'bureaucracy', removed from contact with, still more control by, the man and woman 'in the street' (which in the Soviet Union means in the factory, in the trade union, in the collective farm, in the block of flats and other places where people with real faces and unmistakable voices gather to work and discuss). Education and all forms of cultural and scientific development get their share of space in the book. And though the authors in their preface write apologetically that owing to difficulties of size 'many important and interesting facts have not been included in the book', they have made a very competent job of their 446 pages, with a reasonably clear political map and a few well-placed pictures. This reviewer, knowing how often people in Britain arguing about the USSR need to refer *quickly* to sequences of facts which are common knowledge over there but are not so here, regrets that no attempt was made to provide an index. The next edition should tackle this.

ANDREW ROTHSTEIN

The Industrial Relations Act: A Comprehensive Guide
Cyril Crabtree
Charles Knight, 240 pp., £1.75

WITH THE PUBLICATION of the Industrial Relations Bill, many books were published to try and explain what the Bill meant and what it would do, and, except for those whose purpose was to mobilise opposition, these attempts were without much success. Since the Bill has become an Act many more books have been and are being published, largely by lawyers (all grades) and lecturers. The author of this book, a barrister and Principal Lecturer in Law at mid-Essex Technical College, suffers from the same difficulties as most other writers and guides on this subject—how to give definitive advice on something that the Minister (Carr) could not explain when asked by MPs in the House, having to reply that we would have to await the outcome of legal action in the courts to define the provisions of the Act by legal precedents. What emerges—unwittingly I fear—to me is the conclusion that the only thing to do with the Act is to ignore it and struggle for its repeal. There is a useful index which makes finding one's way about the Act easier. One's urgent prayer is still 'Lighten our darkness'.

JULIE JACOBS

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUDGET TO WIN

STRAYING for a moment from plans for sales, subscriptions and funds, readers must bear with me if I give vent to a long-suppressed wish publicly to give thanks to *LM*'s printers, with whom it has now been my pleasure for three years to work each month until shortly before the presses roll, at which stage the final production is entirely in their hands. They never let us down, and can always pull some trick out of the bag to by-pass a difficulty. That is probably the nature of all printers: nevertheless I continue to believe ours are especially good at achieving more than the possible.

But back to our fund: and there are no tricks here, though handbags are involved as well as pockets. Our total below represents donations recorded in February, and shows that they fell short of our £100 target. This coincided with the post office announcement of increased postal charges, which have hit *LM*'s budget very hard—a rise of 40 per cent on postage per copy.

So the fight is on to increase the contributions to our fund, as part of the fight by all our readers in the trade union and labour movement to beat the Tories and their rich budget-makers in industry and Government.

Nicola Seyd

£70.32

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Oliver Twist', 50p; Southend Branch, £1; H. Brindle, 25p; M. Morgan, 25p; L. Bates (plus O'Rourke), 57p; Mr and Mrs Guinan, 25p; Blackburn Branch, 15p; Oldham Branch, 10p; E. Strachan Rogers, £1.05; Ben Ainley, 50p; Len Potter, £1; J. Rink, 25p; Mr and Mrs Kokos, 25p; W. E. Rounce, 25p; Marie Philibert, 25p; 'S Mill', £1; Stella and Len Perkins, 25p; R.F.B., £3; P. W. Ladkin, 50p; A. Corbett, £1; S. Morrissy, £1; L'Humanité, 30p; 'Pax', 35p; E. Sheldon, £1; R. Paul, 50p; J.D. (Canada), 69p; B.R. (USA), £2.26; J. A. Purton, 74p; W. Laithwaite, £5; 'Scarlet Ribbons', £5; 'Socialist Sailor', £2; J. Tarver, £1; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 5p.

OTHER DONATIONS include: T. Foran, 60p; H. Davies, £2.60; M. E. Diplock, 60p; Royston Green, £3; J. Fasham, £1.10; L. J. Thatcher, 60p; L. G. Stockford, 60p; C. G. Couzens, 10p; G. S. Robertson, £1; B. Chadwick, 50p; A. Smith, £1.60; E. Dymock, 15p; Mrs M. A. Withington, 20p; L. Agassiz, £1.89; Mrs C. M. La Fortune, 10p; A. Collingridge, £1.60; A. Brown, 60p; S. M. Hadfield, 50p; A. Beak, £2.60; N. L. Wilkinson, £7.60; J. Paterson (in memory of International Brigader Bill Gilmour), £1; R. H. Paskell, £2.60; W. MacKenzie Brown, £5; D. Goodfellow, 20p; N. Dodsworth, 60p; 'Australian Dollars', £2.12.

Our thanks to you all. 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD (01-346 5135)

Bankers' orders to: National Westminster Bank Ltd., Finchley Central Branch A/c No. 37564838, Code No. 60-08-20.

Published by Unity Publications (Finchley), Ltd., and printed by London Caledonian Press Ltd. (T.U.), Watford, Herts.—54787

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POST FREE SUBSCRIPTION OFFER

for Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD

Home and Overseas (unsealed) 1 year £2.40, 6 months £1.20

USA
1 year $7.00 (sealed $10.00)
6 months $3.50

Canada
1 year $7.50 (sealed $8.50)
6 months $3.75

Air Mail rates quoted on application

Please start my subscription from the ..... issue

Name.....

Address.....

.....

Special Student's Concession

1 year £2.20
6 months £1.10

I am a bona fide student at

.....

Please start my subscription from the ..... issue

Name.....

Address.....

.....

.....

Please make cheques, etc. payable to Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Radical Tradition in Education in Britain, edited by Brian Simon. Lawrence & Wishart, 300 pp., £1.

Lenin in His Own Words, Ernst Fischer. Allen Lane, 190 pp., £2.25.

Theories of Surplus Value, Part Three, Karl Marx. Lawrence & Wishart, 638 pp., £2.

The Siberians, Farley Mowat. Heinemann, 314 pp., £3.20.

Modern Revolutions, John Dunn. Cambridge University Press, 346 pp., £1.40.

Unequal Exchange: A Study of the Imperialism of Trade, Arghirl Emmanuel. NLB, 454 pp., £4.70.

Why a National Health Service?, D. Stark Murray. Pemberton Books, 136 pp., 70p.

A Guide to the Structure of London, Maurice Ash. Adams & Dart, 102 pp., £2.25.

The New Battle of Britain: A Conservation Handbook and Directory, H. F. Wallis. Charles Knight, 170 pp., 75p.

Ulster, Sunday Times 'Insight' Team. Penguin, 312 pp., 40p.

A Modern Geography of the United States, Robert Estall. Pelican, 402 pp., £1.

Resources for Britain's Future, edited by Michael Chisholm. Pelican, 184 pp., 75p.

An Ill-Fated People: Zimbabwe Before and After Rhodes, Lawrence Vambe. Heinemann, 254 pp., £3.50.

The Closing Circle, Barry Commoner. Jonathan Cape, 336 pp., £2.50.

Geography of World Affairs, J. P. Cole. Pelican, 478 pp., 60p.

Greek Postage Stamps and Commemorative Postmarks, Parts I and II, Ernest Trory. Crabtree Press, 24 pp., 25p and 28 pp., 35p.

The Housing Bill, LRD, 4pp., 2p.

Northern Ireland—the Mailed Fist, No. 1, Campaign for Social Justice in Ireland, 72 pp., 35p.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(25p a line, minimum 90p. Cash with order to: Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD.)

LABOUR—CP—TU—LEFT books and pamphlets wanted. Good prices. Wants list available. **Katanka Books,** 103 Stanmore Hill, Stanmore, Middx.

SOCIALIST LIBRARIES & pamphlets bought. 01-876 7254. Hammersmith Books, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

WANTED—to increase stocks for bound volumes—any loose copies of *LM* for 1921-36, Mar-Aug 1939, 1940-41, Dec 1942, 1943, Feb & Oct 1944, Jul & Aug 1945, 1946-48, Jul & Sep 1949, 1954, Dec 1957, Jun 1958, Dec 1959, 1962, May 1963, 1964, Feb & Nov 1966, Jul 1967 and Dec 1969. **Particularly wanted are Mar & Aug 1922, Oct 1927 and Mar 1932.** We are grateful for any of these sent to: 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD.

LABOUR RESEARCH

The April issue includes a special ten page history of the miners' strike and the solidarity actions which speeded the victory. Other articles include Equal Pay, Rents Bill, and Conglomerate Companies.

15p, or 17½p post free
£2.10 per annum

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
78 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8HF

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes

117 High Street, Croydon, Surrey
'Phone 01-688 4328

SCIENCE & SOCIETY

Vol. 36, No. 1 — Spring, 1972

Two Neglected Interviews with Karl Marx — *Philip S. Foner*

Value, Alienation, and Distribution — *E. K. Hunt and Howard Sherman*

The Plantation Economy: An Essay in Definition — *Jay R. Mandle*

Marcus Garvey, the *Negro World*, and the British West Indies 1919-1920 — *W. F. Elkins*

The Pentagon Papers: Perception and Reality — *Max Gordon*

Has the Cuban Revolution Failed? — *James Petras*

Book Reviews—Book Notes

Subscription: $6.00, Foreign Subscription: $6.50
SCIENCE & SOCIETY, 30 EAST 20th ST., NEW YORK, NY 10003

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED